

## Section 5

# Responses to Regional and Local Agency Comments

This section contains the responses to comments submitted by regional and local agencies.

### **City of Fruit Heights**

**Comment Number** LA-1-1

**Response** The City of Fruit Heights' support for the Legacy Parkway project is noted.

### **Utah Transit Authority**

**Comment Number** LA-2-1

**Response** UTA's support of the Shared Solution and immediate construction of the proposed action is noted.

**Comment Number** LA-2-2

**Response** UTA's participation in the Supplemental EIS analysis and concurrence that the analysis supports the need for all components of the Shared Solution are noted.

**Comment Number** LA-2-3

**Response** UTA's participation and cooperation in the development of the Legacy Parkway project is noted.

### **City of Centerville**

**Comment Number** LA-3-1

**Response** Centerville City's support for Legacy Parkway as proposed in the Supplemental EIS is noted.

**Comment Number** LA-3-2

**Response** Centerville City's concern that the Redwood Road Alternative does not provide an alternative route through the entire length of Centerville is noted.

**Comment Number** LA-3-3

**Response** Section 2.4, *Sequencing of the Shared Solution*, of the Supplemental EIS describes the impacts of alternative sequencing of construction of the components of the Shared Solution.

**Comment Number** LA-3-4

**Response** The commenter's support for the proposed Legacy Parkway and Legacy Nature Preserve are noted. UDOT will continue to work closely with Centerville City to resolve concerns regarding maintenance of drainage channels in the Legacy Nature Preserve.

## **West Bountiful City**

**Comment Number** LA-4-1

**Response** It is acknowledged that the City of West Bountiful passed and adopted on February 15, 2005, Resolution #195-05, in support of the Legacy Parkway project.

**Comment Number** LA-4-2

**Response** It is noted that the commenter is in favor of Alternative C or Alternative E with listed amenities. Community impacts associated with the build alternatives are discussed in Sections 4.3, *Social*, and 4.4, *Relocations*, of the Supplemental EIS.

## **Woods Cross City**

**Comment Number** LA-5-1

**Response** It is noted that the City of Woods Cross concurs with the findings in the Supplemental EIS that the D&RG Alternative would have substantial community impacts. Community impacts associated with the D&RG Alternative are discussed in Section 2.2.3.1, *Impacts on Existing Development*, of the Supplemental EIS.

**Comment Number** LA-5-2

**Response** It is acknowledged that constructing a build alternative in the D&RG regional alignment would leave land open to development, including land currently within the proposed Legacy Nature Preserve, because the size and configuration of the mitigation area would change with implementation of a D&RG alignment. However, this eventuality is not addressed in the Supplemental EIS because the D&RG regional corridor was eliminated as unreasonable and impracticable during the screening process, as described in Chapter 3, *Alternatives*; accordingly, it was not necessary to analyze and disclose the full range of impacts of alignments in that corridor.

The Legacy Nature Preserve was originally established to mitigate wetland and wildlife impacts associated with Alternative D (Final EIS Preferred Alternative) and now for Alternative E (Supplemental EIS Preferred Alternative).

**Comment Number** LA-5-3

**Response** The concerns of Woods Cross regarding community impacts resulting from construction of Legacy Parkway are noted. Community impacts associated with

each of the build alternatives are discussed in Sections 4.3, *Social*, and 4.4, *Relocations*, of the Supplemental EIS.

**Comment Number** LA-5-4

**Response** The wildlife habitats in the project study area are not considered pristine. The conditions of these habitats are addressed in Section 4.13.2.5, *Existing Conditions Related to Wildlife Habitats in Project Study Area*, of the Supplemental EIS. These areas have experienced considerable modification from historic pristine conditions, but still provide valuable habitat for numerous wildlife species. The species associated with each habitat type that occur or could potentially occur in the project study area are identified in Tables 4-13-1a and b of the Supplemental EIS.

**Comment Number** LA-5-5

**Response** It is not uncommon for members of the public, including special interest groups, to submit recommended alternatives to federal lead agencies during the public comment period in a NEPA process. It is agreed that land use planning decisions are the responsibility of local jurisdictions, and that the federal lead agencies have coordinated with local officials in evaluating potential alternatives. As part of preparing the Supplemental EIS, local land use plans were reviewed for any relevant updates.

It is noted that the Redwood Road Alternative is inconsistent with the *Woods Cross City General Plan* and that Woods Cross City does not support the Redwood Road Alternative as proposed by UBET. A description and analysis of the UBET Alternative are provided in Section 3.2, *Additional Project Alternatives Evaluated in This Supplement EIS but Eliminated from Detailed Study*, of the Final Supplemental EIS.

**Comment Number** LA-6-1

**Response** Receipt of a copy of the correspondence between Woods Cross City and UBET is hereby acknowledged.

## **Davis County**

**Comment Number** LA-7-1

**Response** It is noted that Davis County concurs with the findings in the Supplemental EIS that the D&RG Alternative would have substantial community impacts. Community impacts associated with the D&RG Alternative are discussed in Section 2.2.3.1, *Impacts on Existing Development*, of the Supplemental EIS.

**Comment Number** LA-7-2

**Response** Each section in Chapter 4, *Supplemental Environmental Analysis*, of the Final Supplemental EIS presents detailed impact information for a *future conditions* No-Build Alternative. The future conditions No-Build Alternative is presented to illustrate what impacts might occur in the future if Legacy Parkway is not constructed. These are impacts beyond those already accounted for in the existing conditions No-Build Alternative (i.e., impacts associated with the Wasatch Front Urban Area Long Range Transportation Plan). Such impacts could include

development in the proposed Legacy Nature Preserve if Legacy Parkway is not constructed.

Section 4.12.3, *Environmental Consequences and Mitigation Measures*, of the Supplemental EIS discloses that, at the current rate of development, the areas between the existing developed areas east of the proposed Legacy Parkway and Great Salt Lake will likely be developed by 2020. This section quantifies the acreage of wetland habitat types that would likely be lost under future build-out conditions, and states that wetland resources in the project study area would be either directly or indirectly affected by planned development in the future if Legacy Parkway were not constructed.

**Comment Number** LA-7-3

**Response** Davis County's support for retaining the trail and landscaped areas as part of the Legacy Parkway project is noted.

**Comment Number** LA-7-4

**Response** The less-than-pristine character of wildlife habitats in the project study area is recognized in Section 4.13.2.5, *Existing Conditions Related to Wildlife Habitats in Project Study Area*, of the Supplemental EIS. These areas, however, provide important habitat for numerous wildlife species. The species associated with each habitat type that occur or could potentially occur in the project study area are identified in Tables 4-13-1a and b of the Supplemental EIS. The potential benefit of the Legacy Nature Preserve with regard to protection of existing wildlife habitat from future development is described in Section 4.13.3.14, *Mitigation Measures*.

**Comment Number** LA-7-5

**Response** The federal lead agencies concur that development will continue at present trends until build-out, regardless of whether Legacy Parkway is constructed. The Supplemental EIS acknowledges that the population of Davis County at build-out could be slightly less under the proposed action than under the No-Build Alternative because of the removal of developable land for establishment of the Legacy Nature Preserve. See Section 4.1.3.3, *Impacts on Growth within and beyond the North Corridor*, of the Supplemental EIS.

**Comment Number** LA-7-6

**Response** The federal lead agencies provided a detailed description of the UBET Alternative to UBET in a letter dated April 12, 2005. The purpose of the letter was to confirm the agencies' interpretation of the alternative's components and assumptions, based on the comment letter received by UBET in March 2005 during the public comment period on the Draft Supplemental EIS. That description is available to the public, and was provided to Davis County. A description and analysis of the UBET Alternative are provided in Section 3.2, *Additional Project Alternatives Evaluated in This Supplement EIS but Eliminated from Detailed Study*, of the Final Supplemental EIS. A public comment period will follow publication of the Final Supplemental EIS, during which time comments on the UBET Alternative may be submitted to the lead agencies.

## **Wasatch Front Regional Council**

**Comment Number** LA-8-1

**Response** As stated in Section 1.1.3, *Purpose of Legacy Parkway Project*, the primary purpose of the proposed action is to help meet a portion of the transportation and mobility needs in the North Corridor through 2020, as supported in the CMS. The secondary purpose is to provide a single, continuous alternate north-south route through the North Corridor to maintain circulation and access for emergency service vehicles and other traffic when I-15 is closed, congested, or under construction. Although the primary purpose addresses planning for future traffic needs, the secondary purpose acknowledges that there are existing capacity problems on I-15, particularly during an accident or other incident that reduces the capacity of I-15 in the corridor. These existing traffic problems would also be addressed by the proposed Legacy Parkway.

**Comment Number** LA-8-2

**Response** Table 3-3 in Section 3.1.6, *Reevaluation of Project Alternatives Using Revised Traffic Demand Model*, has been corrected in the Final Supplemental EIS to indicate that I-15 under the Redwood Road Arterial Alternative has 10 lanes (including two HOV lanes), rather than eight lanes as was inadvertently stated in the Draft Supplemental EIS.

**Comment Number** LA-8-3

**Response** EPA originally approved the SIP on July 8, 1994. The Utah County portion of the plan was amended in 2002 and approved in December 2002. The text in Section 4.8.3.2, *Mesoscale Evaluation*, of the Supplemental EIS has been modified to clarify the original approval date and the amended date.